

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Serial No. 09/826,998  
Confirmation No. 3580

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office via electronic submission or facsimile on the date indicated below:

08/23/2007      /Pamela Gerik/  
Date                      Pamela Gerik

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Sir/Madam:

Further to the Notice of Appeal filed July 2, 2007, Appellant presents this Appeal Brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed following receipt of a final Office Action mailed April 6, 2007. Appellant hereby appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the rejection of pending claims 1-21 and respectfully requests that this appeal be considered by the Board.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The subject application is owned by Cypress Semiconductor Corporation as evidenced by the document recorded at reel 011695 and frame 0386.

**II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

No appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings are known which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

### **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-21 stand rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments to the claims were filed subsequent to their final rejection. Therefore, the Appendix hereto reflects the current state of the claims.

### **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Independent claim 1 describes a method for generating computer executable code (Specification -- pg. 4, lines 20-21; Fig. 2), comprising: creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, wherein said modifying comprises activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion (Specification -- pg. 4, lines 21-22; pg. 6, lines 14-16; Fig. 2); and inserting the data set into an applications program to form the computer executable code (Specification -- pg. 4, lines 22-23; Fig. 2).

Independent claim 8 describes a computer-usable carrier medium comprising a computer program (Specification -- pg. 5, line 2, Fig. 1), wherein the computer program comprises: a first text preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 3-4; pg. 10, lines 9-20; Fig. 3); and a second text displayed on a display device along with the first text for presenting a data set that changes dependent on modification to the link word by the on-screen pointer or by modification of the data set (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 7-9; pg. 11, lines 11-14; Fig. 3).

Independent claim 15 describes an apparatus for generating programmable signals (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 16-17; Fig. 4), comprising: a compiler for generating a data set containing at least one field of bits in response to user-activation of a link within a comments portion of a program (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 18-20; pg. 6, lines 14-16; Fig. 4; and hardware

for generating programmable signals in response to the field of bits (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 16-18, pg. 12, lines 10-12 and 16-22; Fig. 4).

Thus, Appellant's claimed subject matter includes an apparatus, computer-usable carrier medium and method for generating computer executable code using user-selectable links (i.e., "active links" or "hot links"), which are embedded within the comments portion of a computer program. Thus, a computer program is one which contains both the OPCODE and comments, with the comments normally preceded by a "//" symbol. As described in more detail below, the comments portion of the computer program can be modified by activating the user-selectable links that are actually placed within the comments portion itself. Specifically, the user-selectable links are placed within the text of the comments portion that are preceded by the "//" symbol. Modification of the comments portion creates a new data set that is then used to form the computer executable code (Specification -- pg. 3, lines 3-13; Fig. 3).

In one example, the link can be selected by dragging an on-screen pointer to the link. When the pointer passes over the link, the link might change colors or otherwise become highlighted to note that the link is an active or hot link. In one example, a hot link may be described as a link that can be modified by clicking on the link to activate a pull-down menu. The pull-down menu might have different selections which can be chosen by the on-screen pointer for modifying the link. Once the data set is created via modification of the user-selectable link, the method may include inserting the data set into an applications program to form the computer executable code (Specification -- pg. 4, lines 20-30; Fig. 3).

The computer-usable carrier medium includes a computer program, comprising a first text preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer. In one example, the comments designator may be recognizable to a C programming platform as the "//" designator. As noted above, the link or link word succeeding the comments designator can be modified by dragging an on-screen pointer to the link, clicking on the link to activate a pull-down menu and selecting a different menu option with the assistance of the on-screen pointer (Specification -- pg. 4, lines 20-30; Fig. 3).

In addition, the computer program may include a second text, which is displayed on a display device along with the first text for presenting a data set that changes dependent on modification to the link word by the on-screen pointer or by modification of the data set. In other words, any change or modification to the link word residing within the first text (i.e., the comments portion) will have a corresponding effect on the data set residing within the second text (i.e., the source code portion). As shown in present Fig. 3, for example, if SYNC link 46 within first text portion 38 is changed to ASYNC, then a change is made to corresponding field 50 within the data set of second text portion 40. By displaying the second text portion along with the first text portion on a display device, a user is able to note (in real-time) any changes to the data set which result from changes to the link word. In other words, displaying both the first and second text portions allows a user to view the effect of a link word modification (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 2-14; pg. 10, line 4 – pg. 11, line 5; Fig. 3).

As noted above, the link word involves at least one word. That word is located on the same line as text that follows a comments designator (e.g., the “//” symbol). Although the comments designator may distinguish the text as containing non-executable words, which are separate and distinct from lines of program commands, the link word(s) succeeding the comments designator may be activated by a user for modifying the comments portion and generating the data set. The hardware may then be used for generating programmable signals in response to the field of bits within the data set (Specification -- pg. 5, lines 16-20; Figs. 1-3).

## **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

1. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12, and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,746 to Martin (hereinafter “Martin”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,865,713 to Bates (hereinafter “Bates”).
2. Claims 5, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Bates, and U.S. Patent No. 6,026,233 to Shulman (hereinafter “Shulman”).

3. Claims 6, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Bates, and U.S. Patent No. 4,541,048 to Propster et al. (hereinafter “Propster”).

## **VII. ARGUMENT**

The contentions of the Appellant with respect to the ground of rejection presented for review, and the basis thereof, with citations of the statutes, regulations, authorities, and parts of the record relied upon are presented herein for consideration by the Board. Details as to why the rejections cannot be sustained are set forth below.

### **1. The rejection of claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12, and 14-21 over Martin and Bates.**

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 12, and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin and Bates. To establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. As stated in MPEP 2143.01, the fact that references can be hypothetically combined or modified is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d. 680 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d. 981 (CCPA 1974); MPEP 2143.03. Specifically, “all words in a claim must be considered when judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson* 424 F.2d., 1382 (CCPA 1970).

In response to the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* (U.S. 2007), new guidelines were set forth for examining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed the *Graham* factors and, while not totally rejecting the “teachings, suggestion, or motivation” test, the Court appears to now require higher scrutiny on the part of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office. In accordance with the recently submitted guidelines, it is “now necessary to identify the reason” why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner presently claimed. Moreover, even if

combined, the *Graham* factors require that a determination of the differences between the combined prior art and the claims at issue is needed. Using these standards, Applicants contend that the Office Action fails to identify the reasons for combining the cited references and, even if combined, fails to note substantial differences between the combined references and the claims at issue. Some distinctive features of the presently pending claims are set forth in more detail below.

**The combination of Martin and Bates makes no mention of a method for generating computer executable code, much less creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, where the comments portion is modified by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion.** Independent claim 1 recites in part: “[a] method for generating computer executable code, comprising: creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, wherein said modifying comprises activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion ...” Independent claim 15 recites a similar limitation.

When looking to claims 1 and 15, it is imperative that the entire claim language be considered. Specifically, claims 1 and 15 describe a method and apparatus for generating computer executable code. Further, claims 1 and 15 describe code being created as a data set, where the data set is created by activating a user-selectable link embedded within a comments portion of the program. Thus, in order to fulfill its obligation of showing the references can be combined and that the resulting combination teaches the present claims, Martin and Bates (when combined) must describe a method for (i) generating computer executable code and (ii) doing so by modifying a comments portion of a program by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion. Therefore, the paramount question is whether the combination is capable of teaching one skilled in the art how to generate computer executable code by modifying a comments portion and, specifically, modifying via activation of a user-selectable link embedded with the comments portion.

Martin does not mention any possibility whatsoever for generating computer executable code by modifying a comments portion of a program. Moreover, Martin in no way suggests that the comments portion is modified by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the

comments portion. The Examiner appears to agree when he states: “Martin differs from the claim in that Martin does not teach the data set is created by modifying a comments portion of a program by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion” (present final Office Action, pg. 2). However, the Examiner suggests that Bates “teaches a method for annotating a hypertext document with comments . . . the comment (text) includes a link word that can be modified by an on-screen pointer . . . the data set is created by modifying a comments portion of a program by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion” (present final Office Action, pg. 2). Appellants respectfully disagree. As described in more detail below, Bates does not teach or suggest generating computer executable code by modifying a comments portion of a program, nor does Bates teach or suggest activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion.

Bates discloses a method for annotating “a hypertext document with one or more comments to supply additional information to a user about that document and/or about other documents linked to that document” (Bates -- col. 3, lines 16-22). “If a comment for a given hypertext document indicates that the document would not be particularly useful, the user may decide to not retrieve the document, and thus save the time otherwise associated with retrieving and viewing the document” (Bates -- col. 3, lines 28-32). However, unlike the presently claimed case, Bates fails to disclose a method for generating computer executable code. Bates also fails to disclose the presently claimed step of “creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, where the comments portion is modified by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion.”

The Examiner nonetheless suggests that Bates teaches “creating a data set (comment list) by modifying (adding comment for a given URL) a comments portion (URL and its associated comment list) of a program (document), wherein said modifying comprises activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion (hovering pointer on a hypertext link or right-clicking on a hypertext link opens a pop-up menu which allows adding comments)” (present final Office Action, pg. 9). Appellants respectfully disagree with the characterizations made in the final Office Action. A skilled artisan would know that a program contains both instructions and comments, similar to that which is shown in the present specification as the

OPCODE instructions 40 and comments portion 38. A link 46 is embedded directly into the comments portion following text 42, which follows text descriptor 44 (Specification -- Fig. 3). Thus, computer executable code 50 is generated by modifying the comments portion 38 of a program by activating a link 46 embedded within the comments portion 38 and directly after text 42 which follows text descriptor 44 (Specification -- Fig. 3). Appellants find no teaching in Bates for creating computer executable code via modifying a comments portion of a program, and certainly no suggestion that modifying the program comprises activating a link embedded within the comments portion.

Instead, Bates provides a method for displaying comments “to a user prior to the user attempting to retrieve any hypertext document associated with such comments, so that the user can make a more informed decision prior to retrieving the hypertext document” (Bates -- col. 3, lines 24-27). Bates discloses that the comments may be displayed in two circumstances. For example, a comment 85 associated with a hypertext document 70 being viewed in a browser may be displayed concurrently with the display of the document by displaying the comment in a window (e.g., window 84 near URL 71) (Bates -- col. 8, lines 52-64; Fig. 4). On the other hand, a comment 94 can be displayed in response to a pointer 90 being moved over a hypertext link 76 included within the document 70, such that the comment is displayed in a pop-up window 92 (Bates -- col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 11). In most cases, the comments (e.g., comments 85/94) are added to the document to provide additional information to the user. For example, comment 85 indicates to the user that “this is a very helpful site on network security” (Bates -- Fig. 4). This is altogether different from the presently claimed case, which uses comments to generate executable code. Nowhere is it mentioned in Bates that comments 85/94 can generate executable code.

Nonetheless, the Examiner appears to indicate that code can be created by activating a user-selectable link, and that the alleged user-selectable link is embedded within the comments portion of a program. Appellants respectfully disagree. While Bates may provide teaching of creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, Bates does not suggest modifying the comments portion by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comments portion. The distinction is illustrated, for example, in Fig. 12-13 of Bates. In Figs.



12-13, Bates discloses that an additional comment may be added (210, Fig. 12) to a comment list when the user selects the “add comment” feature from the browser pop-up menu (222, Fig. 13) associated with a particular hypertext link (76, Fig. 13) (Bates -- col. 11, lines 14-28; col. 15, lines 42-52; col. 16, lines 10-27; Fig. 12-13). The method of Bates also enables a comment to be edited (214, Fig. 12) by selecting a “delete comment,” “edit comment,” or “adjust priority” feature from the browser pop-up menu (Bates -- col. 14, lines 5-39; col. 15, lines 52-57).

As noted above, the comments added to the comment list may be displayed in a comment window; however, like Martin, Bates does not teach or suggest that the comment window (i.e., the alleged comments portion) may be modified by activating a user-selectable link embedded within the comment window. As set forth in MPEP 2143.03, the prior art references must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d. 981 (CCPA 1974), emphasis added. Specifically, “all words in a claim must be considered when judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson* 424 F.2d. 1382 (CCPA 1970).

While Bates discloses that a user-selectable link (e.g., hypertext link 234, Fig. 13) may be included within the comments portion (e.g., comment window 226, Fig. 13) of document 70 (Fig. 13), and that the link 324 can specify an additional hypertext document, Bates nonetheless does not teach that which is presently claimed. In other words, Bates teaches that hypertext link 234 may be activated or selected by the user to navigate to another document, which is specified in the comment (Bates -- col. 15, lines 58-67; col. 16, lines 27-34). By selecting the link 324 in Bates, the user is directed to another document -- altogether different from the present claims that teach the activation of a link embedded within comments to be that which generates computer executable code. The response to selecting a link embedded within a comments portion to generate code is altogether different from selection of a link within a comments portion to navigate to another document. Therefore, Appellants assert that a skilled artisan would readily know that hypertext link 234 is used only for navigational purposes. Even though Bates may include a user-selectable link 234 within a comments portion 226 of a document 70, Bates does not suggest modifying a comments portion of a program by activating the link embedded within that comments portion. Moreover, the browser pop-up menu 222 of Bates (Fig. 13) is not used to display a comments list and, therefore, cannot be considered a comments

portion as suggested by the Examiner. For sake of argument, Appellants will entertain the Examiner's position that pop-up menu 222 might be considered to display a comments lists, even though it is not.

In addition to the aforementioned deficiencies, Bates also lacks the necessary motivation that would enable one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Bates to provide the limitations of present independent claims 1 and 15 and, most importantly, the limitation of activating a link embedded within a comments portion to generate computer executable code. Although Bates notes that "other executable-type code may be embedded in a comment to permit other operations to occur as a result of user manipulation of comment text" (Bates -- col. 16, lines 1-3), Bates still lacks any teaching that a link embedded within a comments portion can be activated to generate code as claimed. While Appellants agree that code can be embedded in a comments portion as taught in Bates, Appellants see no relevance in embedding code in comments which is well-known in program structure. The important distinction, however, is the use of a link embedded within the comments portion that, when modified, generates code -- a profound deficiency in Bates. Moreover, Bates makes no mention that manipulation of a link embedded within code and simply points to possible manipulation of text or comments. Again, the claim language must be carefully read which pertains to activating a link embedded with a comments portion and generate code. This limitation is not found in Bates whatsoever.

Finally, Bates cannot be combined with Martin to overcome the deficiencies therein. As noted above, Martin and Bates each fail to provide the necessary teaching or suggestion for creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, where the comments portion is modified by activating a user selectable link embedded within the comments portion of a program. Therefore, even if the teachings of Martin and Bates were combined (without sufficient motivation to do so), the combined teachings of the cited art would still fail to provide that which is disclosed in present claims 1 and 15.

**The combination of Martin and Bates does not disclose a first text, which is preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer, wherein modification to the link word causes a**

**data set to change.** Independent claim 8 recites in part, “[a] computer-usable carrier medium comprising a computer program, wherein the computer program comprises: a first text preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer; and a second text displayed on a display device along with the first text for presenting a data set that changes dependent on modification to the link word by the on-screen pointer ...”

When looking at both Martin and Bates, Appellants can find no descriptions of a first text and the specific format of a first text preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word. That link word being a specific type of link word that can be modified by an on-screen pointer. As to Martin, the Examiner appears to agree when he states: “Martin differs from the claim in that Martin does not teach that the comments designator may be succeeded by a link word [that] is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer” (present final Office Action, pg. 3).

However, the Examiner contends that Martin provides teaching for a data set that changes dependent on modification to a link symbol (the “=” symbol shown in part 1000b of Fig. 9), and further suggests that Bates “teaches that the comment (text) includes a link word that can be modified by an on-screen pointer” (present final Office Action, pg. 3). Therefore, the Examiner appears to conclude that it “would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Martin and Bates before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the program generating system taught by Martin to include the teaching that [a] link word ... can be modified by an on-screen pointer [as] taught by Bates with the motivation being to enable the system to quickly and efficiently modify the comment portion” (present final Office Action, pp. 3-4). Appellants respectfully disagree.

Contrary to the Examiner’s suggestions, Martin does not provide teaching or suggestion for a data set, such data set being one that changes dependent on modification to a link word. Throughout prosecution, the Examiner repeatedly suggests that the “=” symbol shown in part 1000b of Fig. 9 is somehow equivalent to the presently claimed “link word” (present final Office Action -- pg. 4). As stated previously, the “=” symbol is merely an assignment symbol and is

not adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer. In addition, although Martin discloses that the comment text following the comment designator in part 1000b of Fig. 9 may be used “in generating new compilable C++ code and in generating directives to the compiler” (Martin -- col. 8, lines 60-62), Martin does not teach or suggest that changes to the generated C++ code or directives (i.e., the alleged “data set”) is somehow dependent on modification to the “=” symbol (i.e., the alleged “link word”). If anything, changes to the C++ code or directives (i.e., the alleged “data set”) could be made by changing the specification data following the “=” symbol (e.g., changing the availability in line 1002b from 99.9% to some other value). However, such changes would not be dependent on modification to the link word (or link symbol) itself. Therefore, Martin cannot be relied upon to provide teaching or suggestion for a data set, which changes dependent on modification to a link word.

The teachings of Bates cannot be combined with those of Martin to overcome the deficiencies therein. As noted above, the Examiner relies on Bates for allegedly teaching “that the comment (text) includes a link word that can be modified by an on-screen pointer” (present final Office Action, pg. 2). However, Bates fails to provide teaching or suggestion for the “link word” as set forth in present claim 8 and, therefore, cannot be combined with Martin to overcome the deficiencies therein.

As noted above, Bates suggests that a hypertext link (e.g., hypertext link 234, Fig. 13) may be included within comment text (e.g., comment text 228, Fig. 13) to enable a user to navigate to another document (Bates -- col. 8, lines 1-13; col. 16, lines 27-34). Thus, the Examiner seems to suggest that the comment text (e.g., comment text 228, Fig. 13) is somehow equivalent to the presently claimed “first text,” and that the hypertext link (e.g., hypertext link 234, Fig. 13) is somehow equivalent to the presently claimed “link word.” Appellants respectfully disagree.

First of all, Bates does not teach or suggest that the comment text (e.g., comment text 228, Fig. 13) is preceded by a comments designator (such as the “//” designator used in the C programming platform), as specifically required by present claim 8. Second, although Bates suggests that a hypertext link (e.g., hypertext link 234 of Fig. 13) may be included within the

comment text to enable a user to navigate to another document, Bates does not teach or suggest that the hypertext link may be adapted for modification by the on-screen pointer, wherein modification to the hypertext link causes a data set to change.

As noted above, hypertext links (such as link 234) are included within the comment text (such as comment text 228) to enable a user to navigate to another document, which is specified in the comments portion. However, Bates does not use hypertext links (such as link 234) for modifying a comments portion (e.g., comment window 226) of a program, or for creating a data set (e.g., a comment list) that changes dependent on modification to the hypertext link. As such, any “link words” that may be disclosed by Bates (such as hypertext link 234) are not equivalent to the presently claimed “link word,” making it impossible for the comment text (such as comment text 228) disclosed by Bates to be considered equivalent to the presently claimed “first text.”

For at least the foregoing reasons, Martin and Bates each fail to provide teaching or suggestion for the presently claimed first text, which is preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer, wherein modification to the link word causes a data set to change. Therefore, even if Bates were combined with Martin (in the absence of sufficient motivation to do so), the combined teachings of the cited art would still fail to disclose all limitations of present claim 8.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Appellants believe claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentably distinct over the cited art. In addition, pending dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are believed patentably distinct for the same reasons as their respective base claim.

## **2. The rejection of claims 5, 10, and 11 over Martin, Bates, and Shulman.**

Claims 5, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Bates, and Shulman. As discussed above, Appellants assert that independent claims 1 and 8 from which claims 5, 10, and 11 depend are patentably distinct over Martin and Bates. Therefore, Appellants assert that dependent claims 5, 10, and 11 are patentably distinct over

Martin and Bates and/or the combination of Martin, Bates, and Shulman for at least the same reasons as base claims 1 and 8.

**3. The rejection of claims 6, 7, and 13 over Martin, Bates, and Propster.**

Claims 6, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Bates, and Propster. As discussed above, Appellants assert that independent claims 1 and 8 from which claims 6, 7, and 13 depend are patentably distinct over Martin and Bates. Therefore, Appellants assert that dependent claims 6, 7, and 13 are patentably distinct over Martin and Bates and/or the combination of Martin, Bates, and Propster for at least the same reasons as base claims 1 and 8.

\* \* \*

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of and objection to pending claims 1-21 was erroneous, and reversal of the Examiner's decision is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to MPEP 1204.01, Appellants request the previously paid appeal brief fee be applied in the present case. If addition fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s) or credit any overpayment to Daffer McDaniel, LLP deposit account number 50-3268.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin L. Daffer/

Kevin L. Daffer  
Reg. No. 34,146  
Attorney for Appellant

Customer No. 35617  
Date: August 23, 2007  
KLD

## **VIII. APPENDIX**

The present claims on appeal are as follows.

1. A method for generating computer executable code, comprising:  
  
creating a data set by modifying a comments portion of a program, wherein said  
modifying comprises activating a user-selectable link embedded within the  
comments portion; and  
  
inserting the data set into an applications program to form the computer executable code.
2. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said creating comprises displaying the link  
within a line of text preceded by a comments designator.
3. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said creating comprises displaying a window  
containing the comments portion and the data set.
4. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said modifying comprises directing an on-  
screen pointer to the link and actuating a pointer device that is communicable with the on-screen  
pointer.
5. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said modifying comprises:  
  
initiating a pull-down menu;  
  
directing an on-screen pointer to items shown on the pull-down menu; and  
  
actuating a pointer device electrically coupled to the on-screen pointer.
6. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said creating comprises setting byte fields  
within the data set for defining an electrical waveform.

7. The method as recited in claim 1, wherein said creating comprises setting waveform descriptor commands of a programmable interface circuit.
8. A computer-usable carrier medium comprising a computer program, wherein the computer program comprises:
- a first text preceded by a comments designator and succeeded by at least one link word that is adapted for modification by an on-screen pointer; and
  - a second text displayed on a display device along with the first text for presenting a data set that changes dependent on modification to the link word by the on-screen pointer or by modification of the data set.
9. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the link word and the data set reside within a single window for display upon the display device, and wherein the single window is accessible by a pointer device linked to the on-screen pointer via a graphical user interface.
10. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the link word and the data set reside within two separate windows for display upon the display device, and wherein the two separate windows are accessible by a pointer device linked to the on-screen pointer via a graphical user interface.
11. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the two separate windows are adapted for concurrent display upon the display device.
12. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the data set is linked to an applications program to form computer executable code.
13. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the data set comprises several grouping of fields that define a waveform output for a programmable device.



14. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the data set comprises several grouping of fields that define address, data, control and timing signals sent from a programmable interface to a peripheral device.
15. An apparatus for generating programmable signals, comprising:
- a compiler for generating a data set containing at least one field of bits in response to user-activation of a link within a comments portion of a program; and
- hardware for generating programmable signals in response to the field of bits.
16. The apparatus as recited in claim 15, wherein the link is accessible by a user via a graphical user-interface.
17. The apparatus as recited in claim 15, wherein the data set is linked to an applications program to form computer executable code operable upon the hardware for generating the signals.
18. The apparatus as recited in claim 15, wherein the data set and the comments portion of the program are depicted upon a screen of a display device.
19. The apparatus as recited in claim 15, wherein the link comprises at least one word located one the same line as text that follow a comments designator.
20. The apparatus as recited in claim 19, wherein the comments designator notes the corresponding line of text as non-executable words separate and distinct from lines of program commands.
21. The computer-usable carrier medium as recited in claim 8, wherein the link word is activated by a user of the computer program to modify the data set.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

No evidence has been entered during the prosecution of the captioned case.

#### **X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

No prior or pending appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings are known to Appellant or Assignee which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.